UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,874	03/10/2004	Glenn F. Evans	3382-67148	6617

26119   7590   03/06/2007
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP
121 S.W. SALMON STREET
SUITE 1600
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
AMIN, JWALANT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

		Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary		10/798,874	EVANS ET AL.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Jwalant Amin	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 December 2006.</u>

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 35-46* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 35-46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/08/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed on 11/07/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.   Regarding claims 1-3, 5, 35, and 39-41, the applicant argues that Eid, Denk and Motorola do not teach "... the n-bit representation is convertible to a lower-precision representation by assigning zero values to one or more least significant bits in the fractional component while the integer component is unchanged" (see applicant's remarks on pg. 7, paragraph 2 lines 3-5). The applicant further argues that "... combination of Motorola with Eid and Denk would actually lead to clearing memory of data described in Eid and Denk" (see pg. 8, paragraph 1 last two lines).

4.   However, the examiner interprets that Eid teaches the n-bit representation (16 bit integer) is convertible (shifted) to a lower-precision representation (10 bit value) by

assigning zero values to one or more least significant bits in the fractional component [(0023); shifting corresponds to assigning zero values).

Eid discloses all of the claimed limitations as stated above, but does not explicitly teach that the most significant byte forms an integer component and the least significant byte forms a fractional component. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the numbers 'n' and 'k' such that 'n' most significant bits would be same as the most significant byte and 'k' least significant bits would be same as the least significant byte so as to make the '8' most significant bits as the integer component and the '8' least significant bits as the fractional component because such a representation could also be used in the systems with 16-bit processors by using both the integer and fractional component of the representation and with 8-bit processors by using just the integer component of the representation.

Eid teaches to shift a 16-bit integer by 6 bits to obtain a 10-bit integer ([0023]; shift operation could involve assigning zero values). However, Eid does not explicitly teach that the integer component represented by the most significant byte is unchanged. Denk teaches to convert a real-valued, fixed point two's complement input signal represented by n+a bits in n.a format, to real-valued, fixed point two's complement binary reduced precision output signal represented by n+b bits in n.b format, where a-b bits are designated as the loss portion of the rounding operand ([0082]; Denk teaches to convert from a higher precision representation to a lower precision representation where the integer component of the signal value is unchanged,

represented by n bits). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of present invention to have the integer component comprising n digits remain unchanged as taught by Denk and use it into the method of Eid because the most significant n digits of the higher precision representation n+a constitute the precision portion of the rounding operand, with the remaining a digits being the loss portion ([0057]).

The combination of Eid and Denk discloses shifting and rounding operations, but they do not explicitly teach to assign zero values to one or more least significant bits in the fractional component while the integer component is unchanged. However, Motorola's M68000 Programmer's Reference Manual teaches to use CLR command to clear the destination to all zero (page B-35; using CLR command, the least significant byte of the higher precision representation could be assigned zero values and converted to the lower precision representation; clearing the data and assigning zero values as suggested by Motorola is another method to assign zero values besides shifting and rounding operations). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of present invention to assign zero values to the least significant byte of the higher precision representation as taught by Motorola and used it in the method of Eid and Denk because the lower precision representation is still represented as 16 bits which could be very useful as most of the systems have 8 bits or multiple of 8 bits processors.

5.   Regarding claims 4, 36-38 and 42-44, the applicant argues that Lundberg (claim 4), FOURCC.org YUV pixel formats document (claims 38 and 44), and Reitmeier

(claims 36, 37, 42 and 43) do not respectively teach or suggest "the n-bit representation

is convertible to a lower-precision representation by assigning zero values to one or

more significant bits in the fractional component while the integer component is

unchanged" (see last four lines of pg. 8, pg. 9 paragraph 3 lines 5-8, pg. 10 lines 3-5, of

applicant's remarks).

6.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986). The above limitation is taught by the combination of Eid, Denk and Motorola in

the independent claims 1 and 40.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

8.   Claims 1-5 and 35-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

9.   Regarding claims 1, 5 and 40, the language of the claims raise questions as to

whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a

technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application

producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject

matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Specifically, the method for of representing video data for a

video image, as disclosed in claim 1, a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions stored thereon, as disclosed in claim 5, and a computer system, as disclosed in claim 40, are directed to a mathematical procedure, which is an abstract idea that do not correspond to any specific real world data. These claims do not claim any "practical application" or "useful, concrete and tangible result". See MPEP 2106 IV (B)(1).

10.   Regarding claims 2-4 and 35-39, dependent on claim 1, the examiner gives the same reasons as stated above.

11.   Regarding claims 41-46, dependent on claim 40, the examiner gives the same reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   Claims 1-3, 5, 35, 39-41 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eid et al. (US Pub. No.: 2004/0190771; hereinafter referred to as Eid), in view of Denk et al. (US Pub. No.: 2001/0025292; hereinafter referred to as Denk), and further in view of Motorola's M68000 Programmer's Reference Manual ("M68000 8-/16-/32-Bit Microprocessors: Programmer's Reference Manual", 1986, fifth

edition, page B-35, ISBN: 0-13-541491-1, Publication: Prentice-Hall; hereinafter referred

to as Motorola).

14.   Regarding claim 1, Eid teaches a method of representing video data for a video

image (motion picture), the method comprising representing chroma and luma

information for a pixel in the video image in an n-bit representation (representation uses

m bits), the n-bit representation comprising a 16-bit fixed-point (this representation uses

16 bits; a fixed point integer color component) block of data per channel ([0012], [0023];

Y(2.14), C(2.14) and alpha(2.14) are all 16 bit fixed-point representation per channel)

for the pixel, where the most significant byte in the 16-bit unit of data is an integer

component (2-bit integer part; n most significant bits), where the least significant byte in

the 16-bit unit of data is a fractional component (14 bit fractional part; k least significant

bits) ([0001], [0005], [0006], [0007] last four lines); and where the n-bit representation

(16 bit integer) is convertible (shifted) to a lower-precision representation (10 bit value)

by assigning zero values to one or more least significant bits in the fractional component

[(0023); shifting corresponds to assigning zero values).

Eid discloses all of the claimed limitations as stated above, but does not explicitly

teach that the most significant byte forms an integer component and the least significant

byte forms a fractional component. However, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the numbers 'n' and

'k' such that 'n' most significant bits would be same as the most significant byte and 'k'

least significant bits would be same as the least significant byte so as to make the '8'

most significant bits as the integer component and the '8' least significant bits as the

fractional component because such a representation could also be used in the systems

with 16-bit processors by using both the integer and fractional component of the

representation and with 8-bit processors by using just the integer component of the

representation.

Eid teaches to shift a 16-bit integer by 6 bits to obtain a 10-bit integer ([0023];

shift operation could involve assigning zero values). However, Eid does not explicitly

teach that the integer component represented by the most significant byte is

unchanged. Denk teaches to convert a real-valued, fixed point two's complement input

signal represented by n+a bits in n.a format, to real-valued, fixed point two's

complement binary reduced precision output signal represented by n+b bits in n.b

format, where a-b bits are designated as the loss portion of the rounding operand

([0082]; Denk teaches to convert from a higher precision representation to a lower

precision representation where the integer component of the signal value is unchanged,

represented by n bits). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of present invention to have the integer component comprising n

digits remain unchanged as taught by Denk and use it into the method of Eid because

the most significant n digits of the higher precision representation n+a constitute the

precision portion of the rounding operand, with the remaining a digits being the loss

portion ([0057]).

The combination of Eid and Denk discloses shifting and rounding operations, but

they do not explicitly teach to assign zero values to one or more least significant bits in

the fractional component while the integer component is unchanged. However,

Motorola's M68000 Programmer's Reference Manual teaches to use CLR command to clear the destination to all zero (page B-35; using CLR command, the least significant byte of the higher precision representation could be assigned zero values and converted to the lower precision representation). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of present invention to assign zero values to the least significant byte of the higher precision representation as taught by Motorola and used it in the method of Eid and Denk because the lower precision representation is still represented as 16 bits which could be very useful as most of the systems have 8 bits or multiple of 8 bits processors.

15.   Regarding claim 2, Eid teaches the n-bit representation is a 16-bit representation and the lower-precision representation is a 10-bit representation ([0023] lines 4-6; 16-bit integer corresponds to n-bit representation; 10-bit value corresponds to lower-precision representation).

16.   Regarding claim 3, Eid teaches converting the n-bit representation to an (n-m)-bit representation by assigning zero values to the m least-significant bits in the fractional component [(0023) lines 4-6; 16-bit integer corresponds to n-bit representation; 10-bit value corresponds to (n-m)-bit representation; shifting corresponds to assigning zero values; shifted by 6 bits corresponds to assigning zero values to m least significant bits; the 16-bit ... to obtain a 10-bit value corresponds to converting the n-bit representation to an (n-m)-bit representation by assigning zero values to the m least-significant bits in the least-significant byte).

17.   Regarding claim 5, Eid teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-

executable instructions stored thereon for performing the method of representing video

data for a video data image ([0028]; a memory system stores data corresponds to a

computer-readable medium having instructions stored; application program corresponds

to instructions; an application program to be executed by the microprocessor

corresponds to computer-executable instructions).

18.   Regarding claim 35, Eid teaches the n-bit representation is a 16-bit

representation, and the (n-m)-bit representation is a 10-bit representation ([0023] lines

4-6; 16-bit integer corresponds to n-bit representation; 10-bit value corresponds to (n-

m)-bit representation).

19.   Regarding claim 39, Eid teaches one or more alpha values are associated with

the video image ([0001], [0023] lines 6-7; values for alpha components corresponds to

one or more alpha values; values for alpha ... 16-bit format corresponds to one or more

alpha values are associated with the video image; motion picture data/image data

corresponds to video image).

20.   Regarding claim 40, Eid teaches a computer system ([0025] lines 1-3; general

purpose computer system corresponds to computer system) comprising at least one

memory (memory system) containing chroma and luma information for at least one pixel

in a video image, the chroma and luma information in an n-bit representation, and one

or more processing units (microprocessor / multiprocessor computer system) operable

to process the chroma and luma information for the at least one pixel in the video image

([0001], [0005] line 4-5, [0028] lines 5-7, [0029] lines 7-11). Please refer to rejection statements of claim 1 for further arguments regarding rejection of claim 40.

21.   Regarding claim 41, the statements presented above, with respect to claim 2 and claim 40, are incorporated herein.

22.   Regarding claim 45, the statements presented above, with respect to claim 39 and claim 40, are incorporated herein.

23.   Regarding claim 46, Eid teaches the computer system further comprising a display ([0025] lines 3-5; output device that displays corresponds to a display).

24.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eid, Denk and Motorola as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lundberg et al. (US Pub. No.: 2004/0183949; hereinafter referred to as Lundberg).

25.   Regarding claim 4, the combination of Eid, Denk and Motorola disclose all of the claimed limitations as stated above, except that they do not explicitly teach that chroma information is sampled at a resolution less than the luma information. However, Lundberg teaches the digital video in YCbCr format is chroma sub-sampled ([0073]; luminance values correspond to luma information; chrominance values/colour information corresponds to chroma information; lower spatial resolution corresponds to at a resolution less than; chroma is sub-sampled ... than the luminance corresponds to the chroma information is sampled at a resolution less than the luma information). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to sample the colour information at lower resolution than the

luminance as taught by Lundberg and use such sampling into the method of Eid, Denk

and Motorola because human eye is more sensitive to variations in luminance than in

chrominance ([0078]).

26.   Claims 38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Eid, Denk and Motorola, and further in view of FOURCC.Org - YUV pixel formats

(FOURCC.org – YUV pixel formats, http://www.fourcc.orc/yuv.php, pages 1-15;

hereinafter referred to as FOURCC.org).

27.   Regarding claims 38 and 44, the combination of Eid, Denk and Motorola disclose

all of the claimed limitations as stated above, except that they do not explicitly teach that

the n-bit representation and the (n-m)-bit representation are associated with different

FOURCC codes. However, FOURCC.org teaches different FOURCC codes for packed

YUV formats with different bits per pixel. The labels IYU1 and IYU2 represent 12-bit and

24-bit mode 2 of the IEEE 1934 Digital Camera 1.01 spec format with different

FOURCC codes (page 2; IYU2 with 24 bits per pixel corresponds to n-bit

representation; IYU2 with 12 bits per pixel corresponds to (n-m)-bit

representation/lower-precision representation). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use different

FOURCC codes with n-bit representation and (n-m)-bit representation as taught by

FOURCC.Org and use it into the method of Eid, Denk and Motorola because using

different codes would easily help to identify the different formats used for component

representation by looking at the FOURCC codes.

28.   Claims 36-37 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Eid, Denk and Motorola, and further in view of Reitmeier et al. (US

Pub. No.: 2003/0202589; hereinafter referred to as Reitmeier).

29.   Regarding claims 36 and 37, the combination of Eid, Denk and Motorola disclose

all of the claimed limitations as stated above, except that they do not teach that the

method comprises processing data in the (n-m)-bit representation using (n-m)-bit

hardware, and that the (n-m)-bit representation comprises a 10-bit processor. However,

Reitmeier teaches to process 10-bit video signal by coupling it to a video processor

([0033] lines 6-8; 10-bit video signal corresponds to data in the (n-m)-bit representation;

video processor corresponds to hardware; 10-bit video ... to a video processor for

further processing corresponds to processing data using (n-m)-bit hardware). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to use 10-bit video processor as taught by Reitmeier into the method of Eid,

Denk and Motorola because this would help to reduce the cost of processing data by

utilizing all the bits available and not wasting any unused bits.

30.   Regarding claim 42, the combination of Eid, Denk and Motorola disclose all of

the claimed limitations as stated above, except that at least one of the one or more

processing units is a 10-bit processing unit. However, Reitmeier teaches to process 10-

bit video signal by coupling it to a video processor ([0033] lines 6-8; 10-bit video signal

corresponds to data in 10-bit representation/number of bits in the lower-precision

representation; video processor corresponds to processing unit; 10-bit video ... to a

video processor for further processing corresponds to 10-bit processing unit). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to use 10-bit video processor as taught by Reitmeier into the method of Eid,

Denk and Motorola because this would help to reduce the cost of processing data by

utilizing all the bits available and not wasting any unused bits.

31.   Regarding claim 43, the statements presented above, with respect to claims 40

and 42, are incorporated herein.

32.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jwalant Amin whose telephone number is 571-272-

2455. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-7653. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J. A.   3\1\07

MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600